THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

ITS HISTORY AND POLICY. A SPEECH

BY THE HON. JOHN SHERMAN OF OHIO.

Delivered last evening at the Cooper Institute.

A large andience gathered at the Cooper Institut hat evening to listen to the speech of the Hon. John Seerman of Ohio. Many distinguished chizens from other States were on the platform, among whom were the Hon. N. P. Banks of Massachusetts, ex Lieut. Gov. Ford and the Hon. R. C. Parsons of Ohio, the Hen. Daniel E. Somes of Maine, and the Hon. N. D. Sperry of Connecticut, Mr. SHERMAN said:

Mr. Sherman said:

Ladies and Gentlemen: I accepted the invitation of the Young Men's Republican Union of the City of New York to deliver one of a series of political addresses at this place with some hesitation. I knew I would have to speak to those familiar with all the political topics of the day, and that my public duties would allow me but little time for preparation. Could I have foreseen this spectacle, this crowded array of ladies and gentlemen, could I have anticipated so generous and hearty a reception, I would have been deterred from the, to me, novel effect of transferring a political speech from the stump or the hall of legislation to the lecture room. Trusting, however, to your indulgence, I will attempt only a simple state ment of the issues dividing the two great political organizations of the day.

ion to the lecture room. Trusting, however, to your inchigence. I will attempt only a simple state ment of the issues dividing the two great political organizations of the day.

The President of the United States, in his last aumant message to Congress, declares that it has been established that every citizen owning slaves may take them into the Territories of the United States, and there hold them as elaves; and that his right to do so must be protected by the Judicial, Legislative, and Excentive branches of the Government. He further declares that neither Congress, nor any Territorial Legislative, nor any human power, has any authority to annel or impair this vested right. In a former message asys that slaves are regarded by the Constitution of the United States as property—the same as horses or earthe—and may be carried into the Territories of the United States, and there held as slaves, not only without local or Congressional law, but in defiance of both. The Democratic party adopts these propositions as part of its political creed. I fairly state them as among the recognized principles of that party—I mean of the controlling majority which guides its councils, and not the exceptional fragments that has guon its onickirts.

The Republican party denies these propositions, and insist that Slavery is the creature of local law, dependent entirely upon the law of the State in which it exists, limited to the jurisdiction of the State; excepting only that if the slave secapes he may be recaptured. And the Republican party affirms that Slavery is a social, moral, and political evil, and that it is the right and duty of Congress and of the people to prevent its extension into free territory.

Upon this issue, mainly, the Republican and Democratic parties are about to enter into a contest for the administration of the Government for four years; and, perhaps, for a generation. This contest is no factious strife. It is a constitutional trial between opposing ideas, to be conducted in the more party, however, enters the

They will sink the ship that has thus far borne us as a nation on a voyage so prosperous that the history of man does not present its parallel. They tell us that if the slaveholders of this country are not allowed to carry their slaves into free territory, and there hold them as slaves, they will commit an overt act of treasen. They tell us that if a Republican President be elected, they will resist his insuguration with open force. These extraordinary threats are made by men in high position in the Democratic party—by the men who asually control that party. The Republican party is compelled, at the outset, to consider whether it will yield its political organization, surrender all its deeply cherished principles, and all the power and patronage of the Government, to the menace of such adversaries. This is a question of manhood as well as of principle. When they assume to be our governors, it is high time to test the virtue of their claim. The natural effect of such menaces is to excite the Auglo Saxon spirit of us all. When the gauntlet is thus thrown at our feet we will take it up. As their equals and peers, we will insist that the majority shall exercise its right in conformity with the Constitution and laws to select the agents of the Government. We will defend them in the exercise of their lawful functions, and I have no doubt there are nativotic men enough in every State to punish all who They will sink the ship that has thus far borne us as

their lawful functions, and I have no doubt there are patriotic men enough in every State to purish all who attempt to execute such threats.

But, while it is our duty not to be moved by these threats, it is equally our duty fairly to examine the claims of these opposing parties, and to test them by a practical contrast of their public measures and policy. The Republican party is only six years old, but its principles are as old as the Government. Its cardinal doctrine was first formally aunounced in July, 1787, by the Congress of the Confederation, which prohibited Slavery in all the then existing Territories of the United States by an ordinance declared to be irrevocable. The National Convention, then in session, and composed in part of the same persons, engrafted in the Constitution a provision that Congress shall have power to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting, the territory or other property

power to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting, the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

The first Congress approved, ratified, and confirmed the ordinance of 1787 against Siavery. Since that time Congress has repeatedly exercised its plenary power over the Territories by prohibiting the importation of slaves into them.

In 1810 the Supreme Court of the United States (see Peters 6, Cranch 336) affirmed this power as follows:

"The power of governing and legislating for a Territory is the inevitable consequence of the right to acquire and hold territory. Could this position be contested, the Constitution declares that 'Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States. Accordingly, we find Congress possessing and exercising the ABSOLUTE and UNDISPUTED power of governing and Egislating for the Territory of Orleans."

In 1820, after a full debate in the act admitting Missers of the records. That in all thet territory is the standard of the territory of Orleans."

"ABSOLUTE and UNDISPUTED power of governing and legislating for the Territory of Orleans."

In 1820, after a full debate in the act admitting Misseuri, Congress enacted "That in all that territory ceded by France to the United States, under the name of Louisiana, which lies north of 35° 30° of north latitude, not included within the limits of the State contemplated by this act, "SLAVERY AND INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE, otherwise than as the punchament of crimes, SHALL RE, AND IS HEREBY, FOR-EYER PROHIBITED."

This prohibition received the unaximous sanction of President Monroe and his Cabinet, of which Mr. Calbons and Mr. J. Q. Adams were leading members.

In 1828, in Canter's case, (I Peters' Rep., 511), the Supreme Court of the United States again held as follows: "In the mean time Florida continues to be a "Territory of the United States, governed by that clause in the Constitution which empowers Congress" to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the united States. "" The right to govern may be the inevitable consequence of the right to sequire territory. Whichever may be the source whence the power may be derived, the possession of it is unquestioned. "In legislating for the Territories, Congress exercises the combined powers of the General and of a State Government." When the Territory of Oregon was organized, Congress again prohibited Slavery, in the words of the ordinance of 1787.

In 1850, Utah and New-Mexico were organized as Territories, when the power of Congress was first seriously disputed. It was not then exercised, chiefly

In 1850, Utah and New-Mexico were organized as Territories, when the power of Congress was first seriously disputed. It was not then exercised, chiefly became it was believed Siavery was sufficiently prohibited by the local Mexican laws and the supposed ffeet of climate.

The controling idea upon which the Compromise measures of 1850 was based, is thus stated by Mr. Webster, in his celebrated speech of the 7th of March, 1850: "And now I say, Sir, as the proposition upon "which I stand this day, that there is not at this moment within the United States, or any Territory of "the United States, a single foot of land the character of which, in regard to its being free-soil territory or slave territory, is not fixed by some law, and some unrepealable law, beyond the power of the Greenment."

erament."
What would Mr. Webster have said if he could what would Mr. Webster have said if he could have foreseen the repeal of one of these unrepealable laws within five years? What would he have said if he could have foreseen the Dred Scott decision and the Slave Code of New-Mexico? Again, he said: "Sir, whenever there is a foot of land to be said back "from becoming slave Territory, I am ready to as-

sert the principle of the exclusion of Slavery. I am pledged to it from the year 1837. I have been pledged to it again and again, and I will perform

"pledged to it from the year 1837. I have been pledged to it again and again, and I will perform these pledges."

I have tans shown, by well-known political events, that the power of Congress to prohibit Slavery in the Territories was recognized and acted upon. The distinction between States and Territories—that in States to the Congress could not interfere with Slavery, but that it could in Territories—was recognized by every Department of the Government, and had been so exercised, that in the opinion of our greatest estatement, the Slavery question was settled for a generation, at least. The Republican party has never proposed to exercise this power further than to keep Slavery out of the Territory covered by the Missouri restriction, and out of that acquired as free Territory. Let us now see the origin of the present controversy:

In the contest of 1852, the old Whig and Democratic parties had united substantially on the same platform. Both acquiesced in the Compromise measures of 1850. Military grants and preemption laws had, for the time, disposed of the land question. The distinction between a revenue tariff, with incidental protection, and a protective tariff, had become so nice and refined that the popular mind would not draw them. Men voted with their party rather from habit than from choice, and with a general indifference as to results.

The Democratic party succeeded in the contest; sectional strife was soothed by deceitful promises of the finality of the compromises. But there was a great, controlling interest—an interest above parties—keen to discern, and prompt to seize upon the opportunity to extend its power. It extorted from the ambidous politicians at Washington the repeal of the Missour restriction, by the aid, as I verily believe, of a scandalous abuse of Executive patronage. So unexpected was this act of bad faith, that the country only awoke from its elumbers to find that it had already been consummated. I will not examine the pretenses upon which it was founded, for the delusive cry of P

which it was founded, for the delusive cry of Popular Sovereignty is now rejected by every organ of the Democratio party. The declaration of the President, the decision of the Supreme Court, the vetoes of the Governore of Kausas and Nebraska, the action of the Senate and House, all show that it was a cheat and a sham. Its true purpose was, by removing a legislative restriction, to allow Slavery to extend into Kausas, and thence over all the Territories.

Must we submit to it? Must Negro Slavery be established where it was agreed Free Labor should exist? If not, how were we to prevent it? These were the questions Northern men were compelled to answer. The Southern wing of the Whig party was too timid to resist the repeal of the Missouri restriction, or any other measure in the interest of Slavery. We could hope but little aid from them, and there was no other political organization of sufficient power and influence to resist it. But the outraged and indignant public sentiment of the Free States speedily found an embodiment in a new organization. All who were opposed to this messure, designed, as we believed, to extend Slavery, founded in dishonor, carried by corruption, and bearing deception on its face, rallied around the Republican standard. They consisted of three classes, who had for years been arrayed in hostile parties. There was the great body of mechanics and husiness men, who believed in the industrial policy of of the Whig party; there was a portion of the Democrats of the North who were not willing to sustain their party in its abandonment of the settled policy of the Government, and in converting their organization into a mere instrument to extend Slavery; and there were the earnest Anti-Slavery men who fought against Slavery as a great social enormity. These men, disregarding mere party names

salewry; and there were the earnest Amistaction of the new tool of the new too

Professing to follow the teachings of the great Whig leader, they contributed by their votes for a third can didate to perpetuate the ascendency of a party whose latest act was the abrogation of a compromise rendered doubly sacred by its historic connection with the hallowed name of Henry Clay—a name that is yet garlanded with fresh flowers in the hearts of millions of his countrymen; a name that is the emulation of youth and of manhood, the standard of all that is manly and noble.

his countrymen; a name that is the emulation of youth and of manhood, the standard of all that is manly and noble.

Mr. Buchanan was elected President, and soon after the attempt to force Slavery upon Kansas was renewed with fresh energy. Democratic officials engaged in forging and swearing to returns of the election of delegates to the Lecompton Constitutional Convention. The men so declared elected, gravely met and framed a Constitution, in which they declared that property in slaves was higher than and above all law. That instrument was sent to a Democratic President and Cabinet for approval, and it was approved. It was followed by remonstrance, by the condemnation of a popular vote in Kansas, by the clearest evidence that it was a fraud consummated by the wholesale commission of the meanest crimes known to the criminal code. Yet, having been approved by a Democratic President and Cabinet, it received the further sanction of a Democratic Senate, and would have been invested with all the power and force of an act of Congress, but for the united, stardy opposition of the Republican party. And I am glad to say, that in this controversy the Republicans were aided by the Senators and Representatives of that middle class of nen who defeated them in the Presidential contest, and also by some Democrats, now known as Anti-Lecompton Democrats. Even those nervous gentlemen who look upon this Union as a consumptive, dyspeptic patient, in danger of speedy dissolution, must have enjoyed a temporary relief when Crittenden, Bell, Davis, Marshall, Gilmer—all on "the national side of the "line"—joined the Republicans in their opposition to the chief measure of this Administration.

Another significant circumstance connected with this memorable controversy is, that the principal element of the strength of one of the prominent Democratic candidates for the Presidential nomination consists in the fact that throughout the struggle he acted with the Republicans. If the controlling interest in the Democratic party shall allow Mr. D

his fate, I will do him the justice to say that his caure of Republicanism.

Well, gentlemen, Lecompton was defeated; but the Democratic party covered its defeat by the contrivance known as the English bill. I will not stop to discuss this bill; for its offers, its promises, its bribes, were rejected by an overwhelming majority of the people of Kansae. They now come with a constitution of their own making, and demand admission into the Union. They have fairly won the honors of State sovereignty, by a struggle as glorious as the Revolutionary struggle of our fathers. They form the right wing of the army of free labor, and are ready to shake hands in the friendly competition of peaceful development with their neighbors and friends in Western Texas. Their prairies are the pathway of the onward-advancing tide of sturdy settlers, who, I trust, will forever prevent slaves from occupying another foot of our Wostern territory. Yet, at this time, a Democratic President and a Democratic Senate stand in the way of their admission as a State. Two years ago, Kansas had enough population to be admitted under the Lecompton Constitution; but it is doubtful, very doubtful, without a very special count, whether she has enough now to entitle her to admission under a Constitution confessedly approved by her people!

My fellow-citizens, the same narrow, sectional interest which can soe nothing but slaves and slave labor; that estimates the value of but one production of industry—raw cotton; that cannot, or will not study a census table to learn its growing weakness; that will not read the leason taught by this great city; by such a State as Ohio; by the development of the whole Northern country; it is that narrow interest, brooding like a nightmare over the Democratic party, and through lit the Executive and the upper branch of the Slavery interest which controls the Democratic party, and through it the Executive and the upper branch of the Democratic party, and through it the Executive and reverendgentlemen in black gown. Theat so

States; and that "persons held to service," as the Constitution describes elaves, are in precisely the same condition as horses, cattle, and other chattel property. The opinion universally held by the framers of the Constitution was, that Slavery was a mere municipal regulation, protected by usage or positive law in certain States, but condemned by the conscience of the people of all the States, and endured only until it could be easiely removed. The only right which the Federal Government denies to the owners of claves outside of a Slave State arises from that provision in the Constitution which declares that "No person held to service or "labor in one State under the Laws therefore escape" has into another shall in consequence of any law or "regulation therein, be discharged from such service "or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the "party to whom such service or labor may be due." If a clave escapes he may be recaptured. If he is found anywhere beyond the range of the unnielpal law, under circumstances which do not constitute an escape, he is free; and there is no power in the Government can make him a slave again. Whenever alluded to in the Constitution, it is as a person—as such he is represented in Congress, More than twenty gentlemen now hold their seats in the House of Representatives by slave representation. The Constitution contemplates persons alone, and not property, as the basis of representation; as a person, he is spoken of in the clause which allows the prohibition of the slave-trade after 1808. He is nowhere in the Constitution referred to as property; and we have the authority of many distinguished men who added in framing the Constitution, that this idea that man could hold property in man was carefully axcluded in that instrument. Madison declared in the Convention: "I think it wrong to admit the idea in the Constitution that there can be "property in man."

Roger sherman, in the same Convention, said: "I

"mit the idea in the Constitution that there can be "property in man."
Roger Sherman, in the same Convention, said: "I "an opposed to a tax on slaves, because it implies "they are property." There was no difference among these men; and in all the political writings and judicial opinions of the time, not only of the Courts of the United States, but of the State Courts, North and South, Slavery was regarded as a condition like minority or allenage, which, once removed, could never be rectored except for crime. The language was strong, and breathed the generous and manly spirit of Liberty. But a few years since, in the case of Prigg agt, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Supreme Court of the United States declared that the "state of "Slavery is deemed to be a mere municipal regulation, "founded upon and limited to the range of the territo"rial law."

"rial law."

It was not until the interest of Slavery became political, until it moulded a party to suit its hurposes, that the State Courts in the Slave States changed their railings. One by one the various departments of the General Covernment fell under the pewer of the General Covernment fell under the pewer of the institution, until now the majority of the Supreme Court, prepared by its peculiar organization, have departed irom judicial propriety, and carried to the ranks of a Pre-Slavery political party the weight of their official position; a mere municipal institution, offensive alike from its origin, its nature, its name, and its effect upon free labor, is elevated into a national institution, above the power of Congress and the psople, and co-extensive with all the Territories of the United States.

Gentlemen, it is only important as it states the political opinion of the Democratic party, never heretofore noted for its love for courts or law. It was a political necessity yielded to the Democratic party, and I have no doubt will, in due time, take its place in that multitudinous array of overruled cases familiar to lawyers. In the meantime it has neither the form nor face of aw, except as it affected the fate of Dred Scott.

But gentlemen sometimes tell us they are opposed to the agitation of the Slavery question. Well, how will you avoid it? Will it be by submission—by constantly yielding to new demands? I have been in Congress five years, and I have scarcely known the subject introduced, except when forced upon Northern men either by measures proposed or speeches made in the interest of Slavery. You may purchase peace by yielding up the Territories, and Mexico, and Coba, and all the powers of the Government; and even then you do not know how soon you will be called upon to sanction the piracy of the slave-trade and the presence It was not until the interest of Slavery became po

of elaves among you legalized by Lemmon cases, or some second edition of the Dred Scott ease. The only way you can have peace is to show your political ad versaries that you can ecommand one. As long as the South will insist upon abrogating compromises upon Missouri raids and Lecompton Constitutions, or worse yet, upon converting our highest judicial tribunal into a party cancus for platform-making; so long as they insist that the local peculiar institution shall become national, coextensive with the Territories of the United States, you and they must expect the discussion of the Slavery question. When they are willing to let the two systems of free and slave labor work out their own development, without perverting the powers of the Government to extend their institution of Slavery over Free Territory, all agitation in the Free States will cease, and not before.

We have heard a good deal of complaint that we have circulated a book written by a native and citizen of a Slave State against Slavery. I have recently read that book for the first time, and my astonishment is almost equal to the contempt with which I have always regarded the clamor about the book. It is chiefly made up of statistical information showing the relative value of free and slave labor, and of the opinions of eminent men from the North and the South, of this and foreign countries, as to the social, moral, and political influence of Slavery. So far as this information goes, it is eminently proper for circulation. Such portions could be read with profit by the every men who have made the most clamor about the book. It is a book that I believe asy intelligent man could read, condemning what is wrong in it, and yet obtaining from it useful suggestions. That portion of the book written by the author which is addressed to his fellow non-slaveholders of the Southern States eyinces a bitterness that has its parallel in the speeches and denunciations made by men in the interest of Slavery on the floor of Congress. I have listened, over and over sgain

The anthor has evidently caught the spirit that pervades his book in a climate different from ours. The advice of Helper to his fellow non-slaveholders that they could abolish a system that bears heavily upon them by non-intercourse, by social proscription, by severing all the ties of church fellowship, of family and of social connection, is the advice of a heated enthasiast, which, however vindictive, is harmless, because of its nuter impracticability. And yet his ideas are the same, differently applied, that form the staple of many Democratic speeches. Books are written and speeches made in the interests of Slavery, and they will be circulated. If they are false in theory or unfounded in fact, they will be overthrown by reason and argument, but in no other way. The very means taken to denounce a book will give it wider circulation. Thousands who never heard of Helper's book but for the outery against it, have read and will read it; and permit me to add, gentlemen, that no institution or system can or ought to stand in a free Government like ours, that is afraid to meet and unable to answer by fact and argument any book that can be written.

None knew better how groundless was the clamor against this book than the very men who made it; none knew better my opinions than they did, and, in the frankness of private intercourse, I never knew one of them who did not respect the houset conviction of the Northern people against Slavery. But the clamor was to deter the Southern Opposition from acting with the Republicans, to mislead the Southern people as to our principles and purposes, and to give a few Northern men, elected by Republican votes, a pretext for violating their engagements.

Perhaps it is well to repeat what the Republicans will not do. They will not interfere, directly nor indirectly, with Slavery less an evil in a State than in a Territory, but because, under our system of Government, we of the Free States have no constitutional power to interfere with Slavery in the States. It is not because will be s

And now, as to what the Republican party will do, if you take us at our word and help us elect a Republican Precident, I will tell you. We will promptly admit Kansas as ... State into this Union, and put an end at once to that controversy. We will settle with the Mormons in accordance with the Philadelphia Platform. We will prevent the planting of Slavery in New-Mexico. We will adopt the homestead and preemption policy in the settlement of the public lands. We will invite any man, who is willing to work, and has a wife and children to support, and no better means of livelihood, to sid in the development of the resources of our country by establishing a new homestead in the West. And, my friends, you need not fear that this will be a sectional measure, for as many thousands of poor white men in the Southern States will

stead in the West. And, my firenes, you need not lear that this will be a sectional measure, for as many thousands of poor white men in the Southern States will avail themselves of this law as there will be from the Northern States. I leave it to you to say whether, removed from the shadow of a great plantation, where settlements are sparse, where schools are difficult of access, they will not be as happy and prosperous when transplanted into a rapidly growing settlement of free farmers? You ask me, what will become of the proceeds of the public lands? Why, gentlemen, they now go to an army of receivers, registers, land clerks, &c.; and the land becomes the capital stock of Rairroad Corporations and the property of non-resident proprietors, speculators, and land-sharks. Under the precent system, thousands of acres of timber lands without a cabin or "deadening," and millions of acres of unbroken prairies held by speculators, block and retard the progress of settlements. The great tide of emigration is turned from its course leaving uncultivated deserts in its pathway.

You do not feel the evil of the present system as we of the West do. I confess, gentlemen, I prefer a liberal extension of the preemption principle to a free homestead. The hardy settlers who seek homes in the West are always willing to pay for their lands a sum at least sufficient to survey and locate them. But they cannot and ought not to be compelled, by their labor and improvements, to add to the value of the lands of non-residents, who do no good, and only keep neighbore away. The true way of dealing with the public lands is to keep the surveys but little in advance of the settlement, and to survey in small bodies. Let it then be kept ten years for actual settlers, under well guarded preemption laws, and at a price barely sufficient to pay for survey and entry, so that for ten years there shall be no proprietors but the settlers and the Government. This would secure a rapid development of our Western country; and by making new homes, new cust

velopment of our Western country; and by making new homes, new customers, and starting new markets in the West, add directly to the trade of this great city and the prosperity of the whole country.

The homestead policy now proposed by the Republican party will unquestionable aid in securing the Territories for free labor. Slaves and slave labor require plantations of thousands of acres to waste; free labor requires but a quarter section of 160 acres to cultivate. When the public land is open for homesteads of limited quantities, there is little danger but that farms will exclude plantations, and free labor exclude slave labor. Apart from these considerations, I ask you if it is not a noble policy for a Free Government to say to her sons, who are poor and out of employment, yet willing to labor, "Go to the West; select "your homes; the free air of heaven is above you; a "virgin soal is below you, made ready for the plow by "the hand of God; work, and be independent!"

We will then solve the great problem of the age—a Pacific Railway, with its entakints of mail routes and settlements; not on some devious course through deserts along the Mexican boundary, but on that line, in whatever latitude it may be, that the skill of engineers may select as the best. Give the universal Yankee nation a fair chance, and a free selection of routes, and the iron horse will soon be steaming away up those magnificent slopes, stretching from the eastern borders of Kansas to the Rocky Mountains; thence through one of the numerous passes of that great backbone of the continent to the waters of the Pacific! Short as human life is, some of us will live to see that grand idea consummated. But we know very well, by the actual experiment of the Butterfield mail-route, that if the intense sectionalism of the Democratic party prevails, private enterprise will not be left free to choose, but will be bent southward over arid plains neid of some sections purpose.

Composed as the Re publican party is of Whigs and Damecrats, and holding somewha

And the Republicans, moreover, will be prepared to consider the great question, discussed before you by the Hon. Frank P. Blair of Missouri, whether the gradual colonization of the negro population of the United States in the Central American States can be

promoted, and whether this population, which is now kept down by the feeling of easte and by the prejudices of education, may not be made useful and independent citizens of flourishing States in another latitude.

Our relations with Mexico now present questions of contract differences.

Our relations with Mexico now present questions we are sensibly affected by the troubles of that country. We are liable at any moment to be involved in a war by causes beyond our control. We have, in common with her, a border stretching from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific coest. Much of it is occupied by wandering tribes of Indians, who have been emboldened by their frequent successful inroads upon Mexican settlements to rob our acquired "fellow-citizena" of New-Mexico. The recent difficulties made by Cortina on the Rio Grande threatened at one time to provoke an invasion of Tamanlipas by General Houston. Many of our citizens are engaged in trade in Mexico, and are liable to be, and are, frequently involved in the civil trials of that unhappy country. While it is divided by factions, unable to defend itself from even the border Indian tribes, a prey to civil and religious strife, our own settlements are rapidly approaching its borders; our adventurous citizens are acquiring interests in her soil, so that whether we wish or not we may be compelled, sooner or later, to intervene, and either establish a protectorate, or take sides with one of the factions, and sustain it with material aid, or admit Mexico, or parts of it, into our own system of States or Territories. Whether we have peace or war, a protectorate or a scenquest, I ask you follow-citizens, whether it is not better to intrust these questions to the conservative elements of the Republican party rather than to the lawless turbulence of the Democratic party. Why, genulemen, that party would at once pervert all the powers of the Government to establish, by custom or positive law, Slavery in the new conquest, and we shall have again a fierce excitonal strife.

We will be prepared also to consider whether the nests of greedy office-holders, now gathered in our Post-Offices, may not be routed, and their duties performed by private enterprise, organized under Government control.

These and numerous other questions demand all the horse of the force and the

Go to the House of Representatives, where the popular will has left the Democratic party in a minority, and listen to the burden of Democratic spesches there: threats of Dismion in case the people of the United States intrust their adversaries with the Administration of the Government. A proposition to pay one hundred and twenty millions for Cuba, the only place in the civilized Christian world outside of the Southern States, and perhaps of Brazil, where African Slavery is approved and canctioned. You will hear from them no propositions to develop the internal resources of our great country. The black shadow of Slavery mingles with darkness, and controls every measure they propose, even to a mail route or a private bill. As flooke, made immortal by the eloquence of Henry, and his cry of beef, beef, so the Democratic party has its cry of elaves, claves, claves.

What affinities, my friends, have you, the commercial and laboring men of New-York, with these ideas? What the can bind you to such a party? Is it that you still associate with it the names of Jefferson and Jackson? Why, a modern Democrat dare not indores Jeferson's Notes on Virginia. The chief event in the political life of General Jackson was his successful contest with the Supreme Court of the United States as to the constitutionality of the United States Bank, and yet the Democratic party now look to this Court as the Iramers of its political opinions, as the infallible expounders of party dogmas and creeds. The writings of those great men, if read now in a Democratic meeting, would be denounced as Black Republicanism of the worst type. They would be mistaken, as the Decirical metals.

of those great men, if read now in a Democratic meeting, would be denounced as Black Republicanism of the worst type. They would be mistaken, as the Declaration of Independence once was, as a Black Republican lie. You may tear from your political records the Philadelphia platform; you may erase every word written by Seward, Chase, Lincoln, or any other Republican, eince the reorganization of that party in 1855, and yet you will find the Republican platform in the writings of Jefferson, Randelph, Mason, and Clay; but you will took in vain in anything they said or did to justify the last or the present administration. Think of Henry Clay striking from the statute-book the healing measure of 1820! Think of Jefferson, the author of Slavery prohibilion, leading hordes of excited men to force upon an infant Territory the institution of Slavery!

to justify the last or the precent administration. Think of Henry Clay striking from the statute-book the healing measure of 1829! Think of Jefferson, the author of Slavery prohibition, leading hordes of excited men to force upon an infant Territory the institution of Slavery!

Think of Jefferson, or Jackson, or Clay, aiding John Calhoun in forging or uttering forged election returns, building a fraudulent Government upon them, and then using all the powers of the Government to induce Congress to sanction the fraud! Think of such men carefully dividing out among party favorites the prolits of coal agencies, live-oak contracts, and the patronage of your navy yards! Think of them, pleading "gray hairs" as an exemption against legislative inquiry.

And now, gentlemen, I sak you to look back over the record I have presented, and tell me what act of aggreeion has been attempted or advised by the Republican party. I do not ask you whather Republicans been attempted or advised by the Republican party. I do not ask you whether Republicans is a lam, to the ordinary language of our adversaries, you would give us a ready absolution for all such sins. But I again ask you what wrong measures have they resisted during all the fierce contentions of the past five years? They tell us that we are exctionaliste; and yet when have we infriged upon any right of any Southern citizen, or any Southern State? Our whole warfare has been in defense of the freedom of the Territories, part of which was acquired by conquest from Mexico as Free Territory; and which, by your beir, we "Black Republicans" indent to keep forever free for the labor of white men from the North and South, from the East and the West. Is it probable that a party that has been so moderate and conservative when engaged in a continuous struggle, will be less mederate and conservative when it shall be charged with the administration of all the powers of the Government? In there not danger, even, that it will forget the sentiment that elevated it?

The North is naturally

ufacturing enterprise of New-England and the Middle States, the commercial interests of the lake and Atlantic seaboard, operate as friendly aids to each other, and as healthy checks upon any policy that would exalt the one to the injury of the other. The relations of trade, moreover, existing between the manufacturing and commercial States and the Southern sections of the Confederacy, have also contributed much to the cultivation of a liberal spirit of concession and forbearance. The aggregate political opinion, the deliberate political action, of vast communities of men thus educated in different pursuits, entertaining, individually, different ideas, and alming at different objects in life, can never swerve far from the average line of right; for these opposing forces of thought, like the antagonistic forces of gravitation, will keep that opinion in its true and natural orbit. Men who, from boyhood, have been taught to respect the constitutional rights of every section, and to regard the preservation of the union of these States as a sacred duty, can never, in the absence of an all-controlling interest like that which overshadows the Slave States, be induced to infringe upon the one or to endanger the other. Therefore it is that conservation, true conservation, which looks beyond a single section, and surveys the broader field of the whole country, is the natural outgrowth of the social and industrial systems of the Free States. This conservative sentiment has, on more than one occasion, degenerated into timidity; and it is even now securely relied upon as an element of strength for the South in the coming contest.

In the North opinion is free; and wherever opinion is free, the right is more than a match for the wrong-them, the may write about it, talk about it, preach about it. Here we are not afraid of a tract, a book, or a speech. Freedom of discussion always begets difference of opinion. In the South, opinion upon the Slavery question is not free; the most moderate opinions against Slavery cannot there be

which the Southern mind can be reached upon to search elect of Savery. It was considered a remarakable fact that Cassins M. Clay, a native of Kentucky, should deliver a Republican speech in the Capitol of his native State.

How, then, can the Republican party establish a foothold in any Southern State? Only, when having possession of the powers of the Government, it may, by a wise and moderate policy, give the lie to the slanders of its adversaries; and when it can dispel this fears of the timid, conquer the prejudices of the ignorant, and convince the reason of the intelligent. Sir, there is no middle ground; we must cither yield to the intense sectionalism of the Democratic party, or we must crush it out through the agency and by the triumph of the Republican party.

The Republican party is prepared for the contest. It but awaits the action of the Chicago Convention to designate its leaders. Let it name any one of the greatmen who are identified with its principles, with or without a platform—be its name and its history its true platform—and then let it, as the representative of freezen, appeal to the intelligence of the people.

Let us not be diverted by the third party, scarcely heard of since 1856, now rising under the drill of well-pald sergeants of the Democratic party. The times are too earnest for such movements. I have before me the address of the National Union Committee, in Warbington, to the people of the United States. It is signed by many gentlemen for whom I have high respect, and with whom I have acted often. I can pledge them that every Republican is as earnest in his devotion to the Union and the Constitution as they are; and sa this is the staple of their party cry, I hope they will share it with us, as we are willing to thate it with them, against the only men who threaten the Union or who seek to subvert the Constitution. In acting together, no surrender of principle is required of us of them. So far, at least, as Republicans are concerned, I know of no reason why they cannot coperate with

lished at Chambery, Savoy, which has been an un flinching opponent of aunexation, has now stopped its issue. The last number was surrounded gubrious in the extreme. The editor says:

gubrious in the extreme. The editor says:

"There is no place for our journal in an organization which is destitute of political liberty. Le Statutet la Savoic ceases to appear. It falls with the two cherished names which were its flag, 'Pius de statut, plus de Savoic.' Savoy is ceded and sold without any heed being given to her wishes. Traitors spoke in our name, and said 'Sire, Savoy is yours,' and instantly soldiers advanced to enter into possession. The spies of the master already are filling our streets. It his sufficient debasement? Nevertheless all is not finished. Savoy has not been consulted. The consent is yet withheld. This still remains to satisfy the lawful requirements of the Swiss Confederation, menaced in its neutrality and independence by the integral annexation. Has Napoleon III. resolved to trample under foot the rights and the interests of Swizzerland? In this event he will encounter diplomatic recistance, protests, and in a future, not very far off, the armed coalition of Europe."

recistance, protests, and in a fature, not very far off, the armed coalition of Europe."

Another Case of Betrayal.—A case of betrayal in Groton, Tompkins County, N. Y., which has just come to light, is the subject of a great deal of anxiety among the friends of the parties, and indignation in the community. The facts of the case are, as near as we can gather them, as follows: Something more than a year ago, a merchant of that town, whose previous intrigues with the fair sex had rendered him obnoxions to a large portion of the community, made a public prefeesion of religion, and joined the Methodist Church, and succeeded in making people believe that he really meant to lead a better life. His victim, the wife of a respectable and industrious machinist, belonged to the same church, and report says that they were thrown much together at prayer meetings, so much so that it became the subject of general remark, and finally came to the sars of her husband. His sus pisions were excited, but he did not believe his wife unfaithful to him until Wednesday evening, on coming home he found the merchant and his wife together, at or near a barn, standing in a field some distance from the house. The outraged husband knocked the merchant down and jumped on to his face with both feet, breaking the briege of his nose, and cutting his face in a shocking manner. The merchant begged for his life, but the husband continued to stamp him until life was seemingly extinct, when he took his faithless wife home, and informed one of his neighbors of the circums ances and that he supposed he had killed the merchant and he had better see to it. The next morning some of the neighbors went to the spot indicated, and found that the man had not been killed, but had come to and crawled home, as they easily found by his bloud along his route home. The machinists wife says that she and the merchant have met clandestinely for the last six or eight months. She has been sent to her friends. The eight months. She has been sent to her friends. The eight

AN AGREEABLE INCIDENT .- From The Louisville

Jurnal the following card is taken:

To THE PUBLIC.—I arrived in this city last night by the cars from Memphis with my negro man, and pet up at the Louisville Hotel. My servant wishing to see the city, I gratined him, took a walk, and stepped into Walker's Exchange for a drink, ordering at the same time a drink for my servant, which was handed him. This attracted the sitention of two policemen, Bick Moore and R. Seay, who questioned me as to who I was, followed me to the Louisville Hotel, and after having made mysalf fally known to them, insulted me in the growners manner, saying that I was no gradients nor I would not drink with a negro; that they doubted I was a Southern man; and that they considered themselves gentlemen and would give sue assistation to morrow in any manner I desired.

I am a citizen of Memphis, and command the steamer Ges. Pice, a Memphis and White I told these two officers this, and by advocation and feeling. I still these two officers this, and site they were evidently satisfied that my representations were still the statement needs also connect, I be not think that this atsitument needs any comment. I leave the public to judge of their conduct.

Louisville Hotel, Friday Morking. surnal the following card is taken: